

Deposition of: William Graylin

August 31, 2021

In the Matter of:

Anywhere Commerce Inc., Et Al. Vs. Ingenico Inc., Et Al.

**Veritext Legal Solutions** 

888.777.6690 | cs-midatlantic@veritext.com | 215-241-1000

# Case 1:19-cv-11457-IT Document 198-5 Filed 07/13/22 Page 2 of 11 CONFIDENTIAL

		Page 34			Page 36
1	A	Correct.	1	and Rotsaert included industrial design file	
2	Q	Later on in this paragraph, it says, "When	2	from ROAM's new reader products," was t	
3	`	confronted by Graylin on August 29, 2012, to	3	intellectual property that belonged to BBP0	
4		stop transferring IP to Ingenico and to	4	MR. WRAY: Objection, lack of	
5		catalog information Rotsaert obtained,	5	foundation.	
6		Rotsaert forwarded the files he obtained and	6	A Yeah, that says it's ROAM intellectual	
7		admitted" that "the quote, 'The most	7	property on some of what we were it was	
8		interesting document is the schematics." Do	8	our requirement. And BBPOS, at that poin	
9		you have a recollection of that?	9	is considered a vendor to help us build it.	,
10	A	Yeah, I remember. Yeah.	10	So they had their IP and we have our IP,	
11	Q	Does the paragraph accurately reflect your	11	so	
12	Q	recollection?	12		<b>.</b>
13	Α	It accurately reflected what I remembered.	13	Q When in Paragraph 49 it says, "Rotsaer freely admitted to multiple people inside of	
14		What do you recall you understood him to			
	Q		14	ROAM that Ingenico planned on building a	
15		mean, your understanding, when he said or	15	competing EMV reader, and they would str	
16		wrote to you, "The most interesting documents are the schematics"?	16	ROAM's industrial design, and make their	
17			17	He even suggested that ROAM should can	
18		MR. WRAY: Objection, vague.	18	final industrial design for its EMV reader."	
19		Compound.	19	Do you recall, was that accurate at the time	;
20	A	3	20	it was in the complaint?	
21		at least seen it and then, you know, he	21	A Yes.	
22	_	found that to be the most interesting.	22	Q Do you still believe that it was accurate?	
23	Q	What were the schematics?	23	A Yes. And that was those were just wha	t
24	A	Schematics are basically diagrams for for	24	what I learned at the time.	
1		Page 35 how you lay out a circuit board and, you	1	Q Do you know who Rotsaert do you reca	Page 37
2		know, design a circuit board.	2	specifically who Rotsaert freely spoke to	ui
3	Q	Okay. And a circuit board for what?	3	respecting the admission that Ingenico	
4	A	For the BBPOS products.	4	planned on building the competing EMV re	andor?
5	Q	Did BBPOS also play a role in helping ROAM to	5		eader?
	Ų		6		M.
6	٨	design your reader products?			IVII.
7	А	We collaborated with them on what we needed	7	Rotsaert around this time respecting his	
8		for our market and then they did the work in	8	transfer of BBPOS' intellectual property to	
9	_	building the hardware.	9	Ingenico?	
10	Q	Okay. In building the hardware, were they	10	MR. WRAY: I'm sorry. Is there a wa	ıy
11		integrating both their own patents and	11	to have that question read back?	
12		intellectual property and anything that	12	THE WITNESS: Something about w	hether
13		belonged to ROAM?	13	Rotsaert knows the transfer of intellectual	
14		MR. WRAY: Objection, vague.	14	property for BBPOS or something like that	
15	6	THE WITNESS: Say that again.	15	MR. KESSLER: Yeah.	
16	Q	Was BBPOS using its own intellectual property	16	THE WITNESS: You can ask it again	n if
17		when it was building the new readers?	17	you	
18	A	Yeah, it would I mean, they're the	18	MR. KESSLER: Yeah.	
		they're the manufacturer and the engineering	19	THE WITNESS: want.	
19			20	BY MR. KESSLER:	
19 20		firm that designed the product. We provided			
19 20 21		our requirement, but they ended up designing	21	Q Do you recall your interactions with Mr.	
19 20 21 22		our requirement, but they ended up designing the product and manufacturing for us.	21 22	Q Do you recall your interactions with Mr. Rotsaert around that time respecting any	
19 20 21	Q	our requirement, but they ended up designing	21	Q Do you recall your interactions with Mr.	

# Case 1:19-cv-11457-IT Document 198-5 Filed 07/13/22 Page 3 of 11 CONFIDENTIAL

		Page 38		Page 40
1	A	At that time, I did I believe I have a	1	speak with any attorneys representing you
2		interaction with Rotsaert about, you know,	2	respecting this deposition?
3		accessing our intellectual property and these	3	A I have no one representing me.
4		these comments, right? So this is what	4	Q Okay. Did you speak of the substance of this
5		what you know, I felt Rotsaert was was	5	deposition and its sort of the nature of
6		supposed to keep our intellectual property to	6	this meeting with me at any point?
7		us at that time.	7	A No.
8	Q	Okay.	8	Q Okay. Did you discuss the substance of this
9	A	Because we have access to we have access	9	deposition with anybody representing the
10		to our intellectual property and BBPOS	10	defendants at any point?
11		provided us some access of course, not all	11	A No.
12		access to their intellectual property.	12	Q Okay. Did you review any e-mails in
13		This is independent of the the acquisition	13	preparation for this deposition?
14		discussion that we had. So the acquisition,	14	A No.
15		due diligence, I think they exposed, you	15	Q All right. You came in cold.
16		know, more things to the Ingenico team than	16	A Cold.
17		what BBPOS would otherwise probably provide	17	Q All right. Let's look at Exhibit 3. I want
18		to us as their you know, as their	18	to ask you if you recognize what it is.
19		distribution partner.	19	MR. WRAY: One moment, please. I
20	Q	What do you recall the content of your	20	noticed this is marked "Highly Confidential."
21	•	conversations with Mr. Rotsaert being?	21	MR. KESSLER: Okay.
22	A	I don't recall specifically the conversation.	22	MR. WRAY: Has Mr. Graylin signed a
23		But I remember just, you know, he was in and	23	protective order?
24		around our building. We had some issues with	24	Q Have you signed a protective order, sir?
		Page 39		Page 41
1		with him, you know, which I stated in	1	A What's a protective order for
2		here.	2	MR. KESSLER: You know, I'll get a
3	Q	When you say, "stated in here," you stated in	3	copy of the printed word. Do you have an
4		the complaint?	4	objection to us proceeding now?
5	A		5	MR. WRAY: I think, under the terms
6		know, our product roadmap and and so	6	of the protective order, before you use this
7		forth.	7	in the deposition you should review it, sign
8	Q		8	it, and agree to be bound by it.
9		document I'd like to mark for you. It may	9	MR. KESSLER: Okay. We don't why
10		take a moment.	10	don't we adjourn so we can get that taken
11		MR. KESSLER: Let's mark this as	11	care of? That part is going to just it's
12		Exhibit 3.	12	going to lengthen the time of the deposition,
13	(V	Whereupon, Exhibit No. 3, E-mails regarding	13	but it's something
14	`	allegations between Chris and William, is	14	THE WITNESS: I mean, this is I
15		marked for identification.)	15	mean, these documents are just previous
16		MR. WRAY: Thank you.	16	e-mails between me and and Coonen, right?
17		MR. KESSLER: Okay. Thank you.	17	MR. KESSLER: Yes. You know, and I
18	Q		18	agree, it's you know, it is e-mails
19	-	did you do to prepare the to prepare for	19	between you and Coonen, but opposing counsel
20		this deposition today?	20	is raising this objection and I want to work
21	A		21	with opposing counsel on this. So we're
22	Q	_	22	going to adjourn the deposition while I get a
23	`	know the contents of any conversation you	23	copy of that. Sorry, it's going to it's
24		might have had with counsel, but did you	24	just going to prolong the deposition, but we
				J 6. 6 . 1

# Case 1:19-cv-11457-IT Document 198-5 Filed 07/13/22 Page 4 of 11 CONFIDENTIAL

		Page 46		Page 48
1		of IP that would basically mean, you know,	1	statement here.
2		less revenue for us to be able to to do	2	Q Got it. I want to ask you now I want to
3		with our own product line.	3	mark something else. I want to mark this as
4	Q	Were you concerned about the transfer of	4	Exhibit 5.
5		ROAM's IP?	5	(Whereupon, Exhibit No. 5, Continuation of e-mails
6	A	Yeah.	6	between Chris and William, is marked for
7	Q	Were you also concerned about the transfer of	7	identification.)
8		BBPOS' IP?	8	MR. WRAY: Thank you.
9	A	Sure. Because that's part you know,	9	Q What is Exhibit 5?
10		there's there's a part of that that	10	A Yeah. This is just a follow-on from earlier,
11		belongs to BBPOS.	11	a
12	Q	Were you concerned about the transfer helping	12	Q Okay.
13		Ingenico to build a competing product?	13	A continuation of my dialogue with Rotsaert.
14	Α	Yes. At that time, you know, that was part	14	Q Okay.
15		of our part of the discussions that I	15	A Yeah.
16		wanted to have with with Philippe, you	16	Q When you write, "Just because you sent me an
17		know, and I wanted to I wanted to bring	17	e-mail to me does not mean you have my
18		attention to that at the next board meeting.	18	agreement and my permission to start
19		MR. WRAY: I object to that question.	19	transferring IP that does not belong to
20		It's vague.	20	Ingenico. Your assumption that the reader IP
21	Q	I think it's a little late. Let's move on to	21	belongs to ROAM was already incorrect. And
22	Q	I see Section I see bullet point 3	22	to further transfer them further to Ingenico
23		or number 3. It says "Controls and	23	without my explicit permission and without
24		operational constraints by the majority	24	any commercial agreement in place was a real
24			24	
		Page 47		Page 49
1		investor exerted onto the company, not part	1	mistake." I'm a little curious. When you
2		of the Investor Rights Agreement, that can	2	write, "Your assumption that the reader IP
3		harm the value of ROAM's shareholders. One,	3	belongs to ROAM was already incorrect," do
4		the BBPOS relationship is critical to ROAM.	4	you recall what you meant?
5		Ingenico's interference with its acquisition	5	A So there are two parts of the IP. Part of it
6		and the current commercial negotiations can	6	is our requirements, our design, our our
7		damage its relationship and harm the value to	7	form factor. And then there's other
8		ROAM's shareholders irreparably. Damaging	8	components because they are the engineering
9		the relationship with BBPOS can lead to a	9	firm that that built it were licensing
10		loss of IP, revenue, along with technical	10	their technology. Basically, you know, two
11		capabilities to ROAM which will make a large	11	parts are all mixed.
12		negative impact on ROAM's valuation." Do you	12	Q Okay. And when you say the two parts are
13		recall what you were concerned about when you	13	mixed, does did BBPOS own some of that
14		wrote that bullet point 1?	14	reader IP then?
15	A	Yeah. Basically, you know, we wanted to make	15	A I mean it's their their hardware design,
16		an acquisition of BBPOS at the time. I	16	our form factor.
17		recommended it. My perception was that BBPOS	17	Q Okay. So I'll just ask it again. Is that
18		was an important part of helping us grow our	18	some of that IP is
19		revenue. So, you know, I had a concern about	19	A Some of it is belongs to BBPOS.
20		them interfering with our acquisition you	20	Q Okay. Now, do you recollect Rotsaert
21		know, our desire to to have an	21	believing that all of the reader IP belonged
22		acquisition. But, you know, ultimately, that	22	to ROAM as opposed to only some of it?
			23	A He may be under the assumption that all of
23		deal didn't happen, but, you know, it's	23	A The may be under the assumption that an or

# Case 1:19-cv-11457-IT Document 198-5 Filed 07/13/22 Page 5 of 11 CONFIDENTIAL

		Page 50			Page 52
1		there's a component that that belongs to	1	A	A, there should be a you know, there
2		BBPOS. And so in my in my opinion, he	2		should be a commercial agreement. If ROAM
3		shouldn't have done that.	3		Data's products was going to be produced by
4	Q	Okay. And with respect to the BBPOS	4		Ingenico, we need a commercial agreement
5		intellectual property that he transferred	5		because, A, that would take away our revenue
6		from ROAM to Ingenico, why should he not have	6		source, so ROAM and Ingenico does not have a
7		done that?	7		commercial agreement about, you know,
8	A	It says we I stated in here, you know, we	8		development of this, you know, additional
9		don't have in a you know, it's ROAM, which	9		product. So that was my reference primarily.
10		is still a separate entity from from	10	Q	Yes. Would it also negatively impact BBPOS?
11		Ingenico. You know, ROAM has an agreement	11	A	Well, we pay a royalty to BBPOS. So as as
12		with BBPOS, but Ingenico does not have an	12		a result, that also can impact our partners.
13		agreement directly with BBPOS.	13	Q	When you wrote, "Your actions and assumptions
14	Q	-	14	`	are threatening the very fabric of ROAM's
15	`	BBPOS' IP from ROAM to itself?	15		relationship with its most important
16		MR. WRAY: Objection. Misstates	16		supplier," who was the most important
17		testimony. Leading.	17		supplier you're referencing there?
18	Α	Well, I can tell you, you know, from	18	A	I was referencing BBPOS.
19		Christopher Rotsaert's point of view, he was	19	Q	Okay. And why did you feel that Mr.
20		looking at and he was product management	20		Rotsaert's actions and assumptions was
21		so he was partly supposed to help me with	21		threatening the very fabric of that
22		product management, but he was also probably	22		relationship?
23		thinking that the property and we have	23	A	For this his assumptions and his actions
24		NDAs between ROAM and and Ingenico, so he	24		of transferring data basically feel like it's
		Page 51			Page 53
1		probably felt that, you know, he was going to	1		it's you know, it's not good for our
2		transfer my concern, of course, was he was	2		relationship between BBPOS and ROAM. It
3		going to transfer information over to	3		certainly hurts ROAM. And I think it can
4		Ingenico and Ingenico can, you know, create a	4		hurt BBPOS as well. But, you know, we should
5		competing product. That was my concern. My	5		have respect for their intellectual property.
6		other concern was that, you know, him	6		And so at that time, what I saw Rotsaert
7		transferring transferring data to Ingenico	7		wrote was that he was making assumptions that
8		contained some parts of IP that that not	8		that intellectual property belonged to ROAM
9		just belonged to us, but also belonged to	9		and that he could, you know, transfer it. It
10		someone else.	10		says, "If ROAM has been using BBPOS' design"
11	Q	And did Ingenico create a competing product?	11		you know, he's making the the inference
12	A	That was after my you know, I was I was	12		that he thinks he should be able to transfer
13		terminated from my employment days after this	13		it and I disagreed.
14		e-mail.	14	Q	Okay. And do you have do you still
15	Q		15	`	disagree, one way or another?
16		Ingenico created a competing product?	16		MR. WRAY: Objection. Vague.
17	A	I couldn't tell you for sure because I was no	17	A	For me, I think, what I wrote at the time was
18		longer involved.	18		was my disagreement with Mr. Rotsaert and,
	0	_	19		you know, to me that was pretty well-written
19	V				on paper.
19	Q	transfer them further to Ingenico without my	20		
19 20	Q	transfer them further to Ingenico without my explicit permission and without any	20 21	O	
19 20 21	Q	explicit permission and without any	21	Q	Got it. When you wrote, "There is an
19 20	Q			Q	

# Case 1:19-cv-11457-IT Document 198-5 Filed 07/13/22 Page 6 of 11 CONFIDENTIAL

		Page 54			Page 56
1	A	I think it should be of as opposed to or.	1	tl	he relationship between HomeATM and BBPOS?
2	Q	Why do you think there was a disrespect from	2	Γ	Do you recollect that?
3		Mr. Rotsaert toward the IP of BBPOS?	3	A	I remember there's some relationship between
4	A	Pretty well, as I stated I mean, you don't	4		- Ben was telling me some some
5		you don't normally transfer, you know,	5	r	elationship between them. I can't really
6		data to another development team without	6	r	ecall what the exact relationship between
7		permission from either me as the CEO of ROAM	7	b	between these guys is that when they
8		or some kind of an agreement, you know, from	8	с	changed their name later to AnywhereCommerce
9		from BBPOS.	9	o	or Anywhere
10	Q	Were you concerned about Ingenico	10		I'm just trying to get your memory of
11	-	reverse-engineering the IP that they'd	11		Yeah.
12		received that	12	Q	HomeATM, but if you don't
13	A	Well, my	13		Yeah. I mean
14	Q	was BBPOS'?	14		it's fine.
15	A	my concern was a competing product that	15	_	yeah, I mean, there's most of my
16		competed against our distribution which had	16		lealings was with Ben.
17		wrong data at the time. So this is why I	17		You've mentioned acquisition prior. Was
18		raised the issue and, you know, whether they	18		here a point in time in which there was a
19		continued on with that process after I was	19		consideration of acquisition from ROAM for
20		terminated, that was you know, that's	20		ngenico to BBPOS?
			20		_
21 22	0	something separate. Got it.	22		More from ROAM. I mean, I was trying to make
	Q				he acquisition.
23	A	But, you know, I raised my raised my	23		What's your recollection of your records to
24		concerns to Mr. Rotsaert and also to, you	24	n	nake the acquisition?
		Page 55			Page 57
1		know, Philippe and Christopher.	1		I made a proposal, and and then, I think,
2	Q		2		ngenico wanted to do some due diligence
3		Christopher Coonen?	3		lso. And so I think ultimately after the
4	A	Right. And Philippe	4		experience, Ben ended up rejecting the the
5	Q	And Philippe Lazare?	5	d	leal and it never took place.
6	A	Correct.	6		MR. KESSLER: Okay. Let me mark this
7	Q	Okay. How long after this okay. Thank	7	a	s Exhibit 6.
8		you for testifying about this e-mail. I	8	(Who	ereupon, Exhibit No. 6, Summary of terms of
9		appreciate it.	9	a	equisitions of BBPOS, is marked for
10	A	Yep.	10	io	dentification.)
11	Q	How long after you sent this e-mail on	11		MR. KESSLER: Thank you.
12		September 17, 2012, were you terminated from	12	Q	Please take all the time you need to feel
13		your position at ROAM?	13	c	comfortable with it. My first question is:
14	A	It was the following board meeting, so I	14	Γ	Oo you know what it is, Exhibit 6?
15		think it was later that month.	15	A	It looks like our term sheet, yeah.
16	Q	Later in the month of September?	16		When you say, "Our term sheet," you mean the
17	A	If I recall the board meeting being yeah,	17		erm sheet respecting the acquisition
18		that month.	18		proposed acquisition of BBPOS by ROAM Data?
19	Q		19		Yeah.
20	V	this	20		Okay. Did you have a hand in negotiating
20	A	Yeah. Yeah.	21		his?
22	Q	e-mail you were terminated?	22		Yeah.
23	A	Correct. Right.	23		What role did you play in negotiating this?
24	Q	All right. Did you have an understanding of	24	Α	I was I was the CEO, so I had a signed

# Case 1:19-cv-11457-IT Document 198-5 Filed 07/13/22 Page 7 of 11 CONFIDENTIAL

		Page 98			Page 100
1		chip did the Telium solution relate to	1		one's pretty standard. This is us getting
2		ROAM's solution for its readers?	2		samples to our team just knowing, you know,
3	A	Telium in ROAM?	3		when we can start testing and potentially
4	Q	Uh-huh.	4		selling.
5	A	When I was there, I don't I don't remember	5	Q	Okay. I was not sure. So I mean, who is
6		if I don't think we had any Telium	6	•	Landi?
7		solution that we sold.	7	Α	Landi is was. I don't know where it is
8	Q	Was there ever an effort to integrate the	8		now Ingenico's subsidiary in China. It
9		solution being pursued by Ingenico with the	9		was a Chinese Chinese company that made
10		solutions that had already been found by	10		POS for China market.
11		ROAM?	11	Q	Do you recall ever informing Ben Lo that
12	Α	I think we had discussions about a	12		Ingenico was passing information to Landi for
13		longer-term roadmap. But I don't remember	13		making terminals to compete with BBPOS?
14		where the Telium solution ended up going.	14	A	
15	0	Let me mark this as thank you. This is a	15	••	discussions that we had.
16	~	short Exhibit 13. Ingenico Inc. 0069335.	16	Q	And what was the basis for your understanding
17		Do you recognize this?	17	Q	of that?
18	(W	hereupon, Exhibit No. 13, E-mail from Ben Lo, is	18	A	
19	( ***	marked for identification.)	19	11	connections with well, Ingenico and Landi
20	A	It looks like a notification for for them	20		obviously very close, and I think when we
21	11	sending samples.	21		were talking about next-generation product,
22	Q	Okay. And samples of what?	22		they wanted us to to ultimately use maybe
23	A	Samples of a reader, G4X in PayPal form	23		their own product. But, you know, that was
24	11	factor.	24		I think Landi was was building products
2-7					
1	Q	Page 99 Okay. And what's the significance of having	1		Page 101 in China, POS products.
2	Q	them sent to Boston by FedEx?	2	O	Did you understand that there was an effort
3	A	That way we can check it out and see if it	3	Q	by Ingenico then to compete with BBPOS in
4	11	works.	4		China?
5	Q	Okay. Now, I noticed that Christopher	5	A	I don't know if it's just in China versus
6	V	Rotsaert is copied on this?	6	11	they're Landi clearly was already building
7	A	Uh-huh.	7		and selling POS in China but it was more
8	Q	What role would he play in checking out the	8		competing agains
9	~	six samples of G4X sent by Ben Lo?	9	al I	POS vendors for, you know, the mobile phone POS
10	A	I think it was in the same time period. Same	10	u1 1	which is another category.
11	. 1	thing, we were trying to trying to get G4X	11	Q	Okay. Was there some concern though that
12		as a product on our roadmap to sell.	12	V	Ingenico was supplying Landi with mobile POS
13	Q	And was Mr. Rotsaert working at this point in			solutions?
14	V	his capacity as an employee of ROAM or in his		A	Was there any concern that Ingenico was
15		capacity as an employee of Ingenico?	15	. 1	providing Landi with the POS solutions that
16	A		16		we were working on
17	4.1	During that time he was he was half paid	17	Q	Yes.
18		by us and half paid by by Ingenico. But	18	A	with BBPOS?
		he was supposed to be in our office working	19	Q	Yes.
19		for us.	20	A	Eventually, there was, which which was
19 20		TOT MD.		11	
20	Ω	Okay So did this does this e-mail raise	21		eventilativ there was which was a concern
20 21	Q	Okay. So did this does this e-mail raise	21		eventually there was, which was a concern that I had brought up in the complaint
20	Q	Okay. So did this does this e-mail raise any concerns as other e-mails in terms of Mr. Rotsaert's sending of materials to Ingenico?	21 22 23	Q	that I had brought up in the complaint.  Okay. And you voiced that concern to Ben Lo

# Case 1:19-cv-11457-IT Document 198-5 Filed 07/13/22 Page 8 of 11 CONFIDENTIAL

		Page 102			Page 104
1	A	Yeah.	1	A	Yeah.
2		MR. KESSLER: Give me a let's take	2	Q	recognize the document, that's fine.
3		a break for two minutes. Let me think if I	3	A	Yeah.
4		have any other questions I want to ask you.	4	Q	As you just alluded to, did you do you
5		VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 4:55 p.m.	5		know if you received or allowed someone to
6		We're off record.	6		received a subpoena on your behalf?
7	(W)	hereupon, the parties go off the record.)	7	A	Yeah. I mean, somebody came by my house when
8		VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 4:58 p.m.	8		I was at the office. I told him that he
9		We're on record.	9		could just drop it off but, yeah, that was a
10	В	Y MR. KESSLER:	10		few days ago.
11	Q	So subsequent to your departing oh, I'm	11	Q	Okay. So I'm going to hand you what's been
12		sorry, are you ready?	12		pre-marked as Exhibit 15. If you'll look at
13	A	Okay.	13		this document, in particular, just a couple
14	Q	So subsequent to your departing ROAM, did you	14		of pages in. Right after Exhibit A, do you
15		have conversations with Mr. Rotsaert about	15		see how it says, "Subpoena to testify at a
16		his sending about a statement that he'd	16		deposition in a civil action"? Is this the
17		sent ROAM and BBPOS designs and intellectual	17		document you were referring to before?
18		property to Ingenico for Ingenico to build	18	A	Yeah, I think this is what somebody tried to
19		some reader?	19		drop off for me.
20	A	Subsequent, after I left?	20	Q	Okay. And you had a telephone conversation
21	Q	Yes.	21		with
22	A	I don't remember.	22	A	Right.
23	Q	Okay. Have you had dealings with Mr.	23	Q	that person and said that they
24		Rotsaert since you left ROAM?	24	A	You can just drop it off, yeah.
		Page 103			Page 105
1	A	I don't recall other than, you know, we had	1	Q	Okay. Thank you. Now, I'm handing you
2		litigation that went on for, you know,	2		what's been pre-marked as Exhibit 16. When
3		probably a good year and-a-half plus, so	3		you had that telephone conversation before
4		yeah, I don't remember having having, you	4		with the individual by the way, do you
5		know, direct interactions with him.	5		remember their name his or her name?
6		MR. KESSLER: Okay. I don't have any	6	Α	Yeah. Somebody left me a voice mail and I
7		further questions. Thank you very much. I'm	7		called him back.
8		sure he has a whole bunch.	8	Q	Was it Keith?
9		MR. WRAY: I do. I hope to go	9	A	I think it was Keith.
10		quickly and I hope to let you make your	10	Q	Keith Wheeler (phonetically spelled)?
11		flight.	11	A	
12		CROSS EXAMINATION	12	Q	
13	В	Y MR. WRAY:	13		subpoena with Alex Graylin?
14	Q	First thing I want to hand you is what's been	14	A	Yeah.
15	~	pre-marked as Exhibit 14. This is a cross	15	Q	
16		notice of deposition in this matter. Did you	16	A	-
17		receive this before today, Mr. Graylin?	17	Q	-
18	A	No.	18	V	opposing counsel marked as Exhibit 1.
19	Q	Via e-mail, have you ever seen this before?	19	A	
20	A	Cross notice. Yeah, I noticed somebody tried		Q	-
21	11	to serve me. Is that what this is	21	V	license agreement. So this says it was made
$\begin{vmatrix} 21\\22\end{vmatrix}$		earlier?	22		as of about May 4, 2010, right?
23	Q	I'll move on to the next question. If you	23	Α	-
24	Ų	don't	24	Q	So that's well over a decade ago from now,
44		uon t	_ <del>∠4</del>	V	50 mais wen over a decade ago nom now,

# Case 1:19-cv-11457-IT Document 198-5 Filed 07/13/22 Page 9 of 11 CONFIDENTIAL

		Page 142			Page 144
1	Q	And whatever you concluded wasn't exclusive	1		Good to see them admit it," right?
2		in the document is what you were potentially	2	A	Uh-huh.
3		going to sell with Ben, right?	3	Q	And again, you're saying this during the time
4	Α	Yes. That would	4		that you're exploring the possibility of
5	Q	Okay.	5		selling these devices with Ben Lo, right?
6	A	that would be the case, but that was a	6	A	Yeah. But that was also my belief that the
7		very very cursory exploration.	7		EMV was not exclusive.
8	Q	Sure.	8	Q	Earlier we discussed how you shared with Mr.
9	A	Yeah.	9	`	Lo your feelings about how you believe Mr.
10	Q	Did it during the previous questioning,	10		Rotsaert improperly shared intellectual
11		Mr. Kessler showed you an e-mail. It was	11		property with Ingenico, right?
12		from, I think, January 2013 or thereabouts?	12	A	(No verbal response.)
13	A	Uh-huh.	13	Q	This complaint was from November of 2012,
14	Q	I'll try to pull that one up. Exhibit 11.	14	Q	right?
15	~	Could you turn to Exhibit 11?	15	A	(No verbal response.)
16	A	Yep.	16	Q	Did you delay from filing the complaint to
17	Q	Okay. So in this e-mail you're talking with	17	Q	talking about these things with Mr. Lo?
18	Q	him about how you're free to compete with	18	A	Did I delay did I talk to Mr. Lo after I
19		ROAM because of some language in your	19	А	filed the complaint?
20		contract, right? Do you see that, like		0	-
21	۸	Uh-huh.	20	Q	Right.
	A		21	A	Yes.
22	Q	three or four paragraphs down?	22	Q	Okay. What did he say when you shared these
23	A	Yeah.	23		allegations or thoughts or concerns?
24	Q	And this is you discussing with him this	24		MR. KESSLER: Objection. Content.
1		Page 143 potential venture for selling other mobile	1	Q	Page 145 Strike that. What did he say when you shared
2		point of sale products, right?	2	Q	these concerns?
3	A	Yeah. This is part of the exploration that I	3	٨	
			4	A	we had some e-mail exchanges, and, you know
4 5		Dight. And so at this time that he sands you	5		we were just trying to figure out whether
	Q	Right. And so at this time that he sends you			
6		an e-mail saying and this is on the third	6		there's there is, you know, any business
7		page of the document, he sends you an e-mail	l '		that we could do. I was trying to be helpful
8		basically saying that Ken Paull says that the	8		if I could, and I think, you know, it's no
9		ROAM-BBPOS agreement only does the swiper,	9		secret about my, you know, my concerns at the
10		and not the EMV or NFC, right?	10		time and and which is what led to the
11	A	Correct.	11	_	to the litigation.
12		MR. KESSLER: Objection. The	12	Q	_
13		document speaks for itself.	13	A	
14		MR. WRAY: You're lucky I didn't pull	14	Q	
15		that objection out during your examination.	15		that you spoke with him, and you said
16		MR. KESSLER: What are you	16		basically you were concerned that Chris
17		insinuating?	17		Rotsaert shared BBPOS IP with Ingenico,
18		MR. WRAY: That you just used the	18		right?
19		documents a lot.	19	A	` '
20		MR. KESSLER: Yeah, but I didn't	20	Q	Sorry, you have to say yes or no for the
21		misquote them.	21	A	
22	Q	On Page 1, you say here, "Yes, I have told	22	Q	· ·
23		Ken Paull and others at ROAM and Ingenico	23		reaction of any kind to this?
23			24		I mean, I think we were just lamenting the,

# Case 1:19-cv-11457-IT Document 198-5 Filed 07/13/22 Page 10 of 11 CONFIDENTIAL

		Page 146			Page 148
1		you know, the challenges that I went through,	1		and you actually have it in front of you.
2		being terminated by terminated by Ingenico	2		Could you turn to the document that has 811
3		and, of course, he still had a relationship	3		at the bottom right?
4		with Ingenico that, you know, he needs to and	4	A	Okay.
5		wants to maximize. So to the extent that,	5	Q	And you see where it says "To ROAM/Ingenico
6		you know, he has a contract with Ingenico, he	6	Q	realities"?
7		needs to carry that forward. And, you know,	7	A	Yep.
8		my personal my personal complaint and all	8	Q	-
9		of the rest of the minority shareholders'	9	Ų	It's kind of in the middle of that paragraph.  Do you see where it says, "The attached
10		complaint, you know, somewhat is a separate	10		
11		case from what he has to deal with as a	10		public record of the suit can be useful to
					you in multiple ways"? Is that you sending
12		supplier for for ROAM and for Ingenico.	12		the complaint to Mr. Lo?
13		And ROAM, if you recall at the time,	13	A	The public records of the suit "The
14		was still considered technically 74 percent	14		attached public records of the suit can be
15		owned by owned by Ingenico, but the rest	15		useful to you in multiple ways." Yeah.
16		of the minority shareholder, you know, at	16	Q	All right. Did you ever work with a customer
17		that time was still kind of left hanging out	17		and entity called First Data?
18		there. And it wasn't until later that the	18	A	Yeah. They were, you know, a client.
19		acquisition the rest of the shares were	19	Q	A client of which company?
20		acquired, you know, with a fair market value	20	A	ROAM Data.
21		and so forth, that it finally got settled.	21	Q	Do you know when they became a client?
22		So there was definitely a a I guess, an	22	A	I don't recall.
23		unsettled unsettled shareholder dispute	23	Q	But they were a client during the time that
24		that needed to be resolved.	24		you were there?
		Page 147			Page 149
1	Q	Uh-huh. So is it fair to say you don't	1	A	I wonder if they actually bought well,
2		remember Ben's exact words to you when you	2		they were one of the major POS providers, but
3		disclosed	3		I don't know if we actually sold directly to
4	A	I don't	4		them. They were not one of our big clients,
5	Q	this?	5		but they were a significant merchant service
6	A	I don't remember that, you know, exact	6		provider. So how did we work with them? We
7		interaction or the conversation and how he	7		may we may we may be we may be
8		reacted and so forth. But I just remember	8		interacting with their gateway for but I
9		having a having a dialogue and sharing	9		don't know if they ordered any products from
10	Q	And this	10		us. But I do think that we connected to
11	A	my information.	11		their gateway or to their acquiring
12	Q	And the substance of the conversation	12		processor.
13		included his reaction that he has an ongoing	13	Q	So you were familiar with them from the time
14		relationship with Ingenico, right?	14		you were at ROAM?
14					
15	A	Yeah. Clearly, he has he has an	15	A	Oh, yeah, yeah. I knew
	A	Yeah. Clearly, he has he has an obligation as well as an incentive to make	15 16	A Q	Oh, yeah, yeah. I knew Okay.
15	A				Okay.
15 16	A	obligation as well as an incentive to make	16	Q	Okay.
15 16 17	A	obligation as well as an incentive to make sure that that relationship works. And I	16 17	Q A	Okay. I knew First Data.
15 16 17 18	A	obligation as well as an incentive to make sure that that relationship works. And I recognize that and I I also had a	16 17 18	Q A	Okay I knew First Data. Were you familiar with an RFP from them for
15 16 17 18 19	A	obligation as well as an incentive to make sure that that relationship works. And I recognize that and I I also had a incentive to make sure that that	16 17 18 19	Q A Q	Okay I knew First Data. Were you familiar with an RFP from them for something called Pogo, P-O-G-O?
15 16 17 18 19 20	A	obligation as well as an incentive to make sure that that relationship works. And I recognize that and I I also had a incentive to make sure that that relationship, you know, continues because,	16 17 18 19 20	Q A Q A	Okay I knew First Data. Were you familiar with an RFP from them for something called Pogo, P-O-G-O? Vaguely. I don't I don't recall.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A Q	obligation as well as an incentive to make sure that that relationship works. And I recognize that and I I also had a incentive to make sure that that relationship, you know, continues because, you know, I was still a shareholder of ROAM	16 17 18 19 20 21	Q A Q A Q	Okay I knew First Data. Were you familiar with an RFP from them for something called Pogo, P-O-G-O? Vaguely. I don't I don't recall. Okay.

# Case 1:19-cv-11457-IT Document 198-5 Filed 07/13/22 Page 11 of 11 CONFIDENTIAL

		Page 170			Page 172
1		appear to be the same document.	1	A	I can't confirm that, no.
2		THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's a different	2	Q	Okay. And you don't know whether ROAM used
3		different	3		any of BBPOS' IP to create their own devices,
4		MR. WRAY: Okay. It's a data	4		right?
5		THE WITNESS: different schematic.	5	A	Not after I left, no.
6		Yeah.	6	Q	When you say that, so you're saying that
7		MR. KESSLER: Are you referring in	7		while you were there they used some of BBPOS'
8		your objection, were you referring to the	8		IP in their own devices, correct?
9		schematic or to the data output format	9	A	Yes. BBPOS was helping make the devices that
10		document?	10		we used.
11		MR. KESSLER: Data output format	11	Q	So it was pursuant to to your
12		document.	12	`	understanding, the agreement with BBPOS,
13		MR. WRAY: Okay.	13		correct?
14		MR. KESSLER: Just so the record's	14	Α	Correct.
15		clear, the first one has 15 pages and the	15	Q	Okay. And you aren't familiar with any use
16		second one, I think, has 13 pages.	16		of BBPOS' IP while you were at ROAM that
17	F	BY MR. WRAY:	17		wasn't in compliance with the agreement,
18	Q	And if you could turn to Page 9666.	18		correct?
19	A	Okay. 9666.	19	Α	Correct.
20	Q	It should just say "Produced in"	20	Q	Earlier we discussed your thoughts about a
21	A		21	Q	potential acquisition or investment in your
22	Q	"native form." And then in the following	22		partnership with HomeATM, right?
23	V	page one, two, three pages, I'm going to	23	A	(No verbal response.)
24		ask you about those.	24	Q	Did you ever fake an interest in acquiring
-		Page 171		~	Page 173
1	A	Uh-huh. The phones supported?	1		HomeATM for any purpose?
2	Q	Yeah. So do you know what that list	2	A	Well, I don't know what you mean by, fake an
3	•	represents?	3		interest?
4	A	I think it just represents iOS and Android	4	Q	Did you ever pretend to have an interest in
5		phones on the market at that time that were	5		acquiring or working with HomeATM for the
6		able to be supported.	6		purpose of acquiring confidential information
7	Q	Okay. So when you wrote to Mr. Rotsaert, and	7		from them?
8	•	when you wrote to Mr. Coonen, and Mr. Lazare	8	A	Not for the purpose of acquiring confidential
9		about concerns about having IP transferred to	9		information so much as just making sure that
10		Ingenico, you were referring to the documents	10		we were able to we were able to, you know,
11		that we just went through, right?	11		license from the rightful owner because there
12	A	Yes.	12		were cross-claims as to, you know, whether
13	Q	Okay. Do you know if Ingenico Valence ever	13		they own it, whether BBPOS own it, which is
14	~	developed any mobile point of sale devices?	14		ultimately why we, you know, why I asked Ben
15	A	I do not, no.	15		to even lay out all of it. So, you know, I'm
16	Q	Actually, I should back up. What is Ingenico	16		not going to deny anybody that says, you
17	~	Valence?	17		know, they own the IP unless it's really
18	A	I think they're an R&D center.	18		clear that either they don't own it, in which
19	Q	Okay. And what does do you know what	19		case we don't need to deal with them. If
20	~	Valence refers to?	20		they do own it, we should continue to have a
	Α	The location.			·
				Ω	
	×			×	
				Д	
21 22 23 24	A Q	The location.  And you don't know that Ingenico actually used any IP from BBPOS to create their own devices, right?	21 22 23 24	Q A	dialogue until we sort out the truth, so Do you know when, if ever, Ben began working with HomeATM? Well, according to the Ben's own